

New York Tribune

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, New York corporation. Office: 100 N. York St., New York City. Telephone: 100 N. York St., New York City. Telegrams: Tribune, New York.

Subscription Rates—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside New York City.
Daily and Sunday: 1 year, \$10.00; 6 months, \$6.00; 3 months, \$3.50.
Daily and Sunday: 1 year, \$12.00; 6 months, \$8.00; 3 months, \$4.50.
Daily and Sunday: 1 year, \$15.00; 6 months, \$10.00; 3 months, \$5.50.
Daily and Sunday: 1 year, \$18.00; 6 months, \$12.00; 3 months, \$6.50.Foreign Rates—Daily and Sunday.
Daily and Sunday: 1 year, \$15.00; 6 months, \$10.00; 3 months, \$5.50.
Daily and Sunday: 1 year, \$18.00; 6 months, \$12.00; 3 months, \$6.50.
Daily and Sunday: 1 year, \$20.00; 6 months, \$14.00; 3 months, \$7.50.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

When the Mountain Goes to Mahomet.

The whole civilized world will read with interest the announcement that the German Kaiser is across the Danube with his victorious hosts.

How impatiently he must view each hour of delay incident to the resistance of a despicable little people, doomed to destruction because they dared to oppose German Kultur!

The Kaiser is eagerly looking forward to the time when he can embrace his royal brother, the Sultan. The Lion of the north and the Lion of the south will then meet in happy concord.

Afterward, in hours of friendly converse, what charming little rivalries will crop up! How William will vaunt the exploits of his Prussians in Belgium! With what patriotic devotion Mahomet will urge the claims of his Kurds in Armenia! And who but these brother rulers could decide such a rivalry?

As for the world, it will, too, await the spectacle in Constantinople with patient expectation. The eternal fitness of things demands that this planet should see Teuton and Turk in this splendid combination, and that two sovereigns who will be remembered forever for their common ideals, purposes and achievements should for a single instant be transfigured in the ancient home of civilization.

And if they should go to St. Sophia, barred to Christians, not to Prussians, is it too much to fancy the spirits of Martin Luther and the greater Mahomet looking down in ecstatic approval upon a marvel beyond their dreams?

Public Service, Not Class Service.

Major General O'Ryan's stand against the acceptance by national guard organizations of gifts expressing appreciation of services rendered during riot duty is eminently sound. He phrases the reason therefor admirably: "The statement is not infrequently made that national guard troops are or may be used in labor controversies involving strikes, in the interest of the employer and against the employee. No avoidable incident should be permitted to occur which will give color to such charge."

Gifts to national guard organizations doing strike duty by business men or corporations, even though made with the best of intentions and no suspicion of improper motive, could not fail of being misunderstood. There is valid objection to the use of the militia in labor troubles, but the state, lacking a state police, has no other cotra to follow in emergencies. Nevertheless, disinclination to do "police work," and especially disinclination of labor union men to be used against striking members of unions, has kept many a good man out of the guard. This feeling is a distinct bar to enlistment which every guard officer of experience has encountered. It could only be heightened by incidents tending to show the gratitude of the employers to the guardsmen. These would be too close a parallel to the accusations that the Colorado militiamen were subsidized or hired by the mine operators.

When the national guard is called out it acts in the public interest. There should be no possible warrant for the assumption that its action deserved or produced expression of class gratitude.

What Jersey's Census Shows.

The census figures just published at Trenton show that New Jersey is suffering from a retardation of growth somewhat similar to that disclosed by our state census. The check has been more violent here because we have in New York City by far the largest immigrant depot in the country and have consequently been most sharply affected by the decline in immigration which has occurred since the beginning of the European war. Between 1905 and 1910 this city's population increased 952,579. Between 1910 and 1915 our gain was only 300,661. The upstate section did better, showing a gain of 359,542. But the increase for the state as a whole was only 660,203, compared with an increase between 1905 and 1910 of 1,046,607.

New Jersey's showing is much less disappointing. The gain in population between 1910 and 1915 is 307,175. The gain between 1905 and 1910 was 393,024. The growth of the last five years has been 12.1 per cent (over 24 per cent for a full decade), which would be a very high rate for most of the older, fully settled states. It is relatively low for New Jersey only because the latter has made astonishing progress since 1890, her percentage of growth from 1890 to 1900 having been 30.4 and from 1900 to 1910 34.7. As it is, New Jersey, with only a little over half the population of this city, actually gained more inhabitants between 1910 and 1915 than we did.

It is clear that the halting of immigra-

tion, the drain of alien population to Europe and the business depression following the European war are materially affecting the growth of most of the big Eastern states. Pennsylvania and Massachusetts will suffer as well as New York and New Jersey, and so will Illinois, another big absorber of alien labor. These states have gained very rapidly in numbers and political power since 1890—New York 9 votes in the Electoral College, Pennsylvania 6, Illinois 5, New Jersey 4 and Massachusetts 3. They will not be able to maintain their abnormal rate of gain, and the growth of the country will therefore be found to be a little better distributed when the next Federal census is taken. The big industrial commonwealths need not regret this. When prosperity returns they will resume their growth at a faster pace which their greater industrial efficiency justifies.

An Improvement.

Senator Wadsworth pointedly expresses the real issue when he declares: "The question before the state is, Shall the present constitution remain in effect, with all its known defects, or shall it be superseded by the proposed constitution, with all its manifest advantages and its courageous reform of known abuses?"

The proposed constitution is not perfection. When it is as old as the present one it will doubtless have been amended as many times as its predecessor has been, and even so, will be about ready for the scrap heap. Public opinion isn't going to stand still in the next twenty years any more than it has in the last twenty. Just at present the proposed constitution is so much nearer what the public wants and believes in than the existing document that it seems almost absurd there should be any question about substituting the new for the old. A vote for the new one, fortunately, won't prohibit any elector from trying to improve it at any future time. It merely registers his desire to give the state what now is a better instrument of government than it has.

For Mr. Wheeler's Information.

The chairman of the Man-Suffrage Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage is profoundly shocked to learn that the Secretary of War has nothing to say against woman suffrage, but is persuaded "no harm will come of it." He undertakes, therefore, to enlighten the Secretary of War and, having said what he can to convince him that harm may come, proceeds to show that in any case we have no reason to expect any good.

To prove his point he refers to the public utterances of Mrs. Catt and Miss Shaw, whose earnest desire to secure votes for women strikes him as a strong point against them. But they are not the only ones; all suffragists are in the same condemnation with them. "Is there any one reform," he asks triumphantly, "which the suffragists advocate as a party? If there is I do not know it."

As chairman of his association it is proper that Mr. Wheeler should be informed at once that the reform his opponents advocate is the extension of the political franchise to women. Were they "as a party" to advocate other measures there might be a reasonable excuse for the existence of the association guided by Mr. Wheeler's intellect.

Mr. McAdoo's Mission.

Secretary McAdoo is going to travel as far West as the Pacific Coast on a missionary tour in behalf of one of his great ideas which went wrong at the last session of Congress. He is not yet reconciled to the defeat of his project for a government owned and operated merchant marine. That economic delusion did not commend itself last winter to the common sense of the country, and a Democratic Congress, entirely subservient up to that point to the President's leadership, broke away from him and from his Secretary of the Treasury when it came to forcing the government into an enterprise in which it would first destroy competing lines owned by American citizens and then, as is the nature of most government monopolies, give itself poorer service at higher cost, making deficits good out of the Federal treasury.

Mr. McAdoo was still full of enthusiasm for a government owned merchant marine when the Pan-American commercial conference was held last spring in Washington. He did not succeed in committing that conference to his pet idea. But he is still ardent and hopeful of the day when he, as Secretary of the Treasury, will be directing the operations of a government merchant fleet in addition to the armada of revenue cutters now under his authority. It is reported from Washington that on the Western trip he will try to conciliate opposition to an out-and-out ship purchase bill, like that which failed in the Senate last winter, by suggesting the creation of a Federal shipping commission with full power to regulate and conduct American overseas shipping.

If the creation of such a commission would lead to a real study of the merchant marine situation, without pledging the country to the government monopoly method, there could be little objection to it. A fair examination of the facts will show that if we want to maintain a merchant marine on the high seas in competition with the merchant marines of other maritime nations we must use the methods which the other maritime powers have successfully followed.

American construction cost, overhead charges and labor cost being above the international average, our ships can meet competition only if aided from the Treasury. Postal subventions and direct subsidies have proved effective in building up foreign merchant marines. They would certainly do that service for us, if we should put aside the foolish notion, which has bothered Congress for many years, that though subsidies in the form of mail subventions are legitimate, subsidies in other

forms are economically and politically wicked.

The merit of a subsidy system is that it puts private capital to use in the overseas trade and creates an industry which attracts ambitious, eager men with a stake in its prosperity. Governmental liability is limited. The cost of subsidies can be accurately figured, and aid can be decreased or increased according to circumstances. In a government monopoly, on the other hand, the original investment is large, depreciation is rapid and there is no possibility of withdrawing from poor investment. A plant once bought and a salaried list once created, the pressure for continuance, even at a manifest loss, would be almost irresistible.

The Secretary of the Treasury has yet to develop his shipping commission suggestion. If it involves merely the creation of a board of directors for a national shipping monopoly, the country will have none of it. If the commission is to be a body with freedom to go to the root of our failure to establish a real merchant marine, its activities may be of considerable value.

Birds and the Crops.

In a brief filed with the United States Supreme Court, upholding the constitutionality of the Federal migratory bird law, the Camp Fire Club urges the proper protection of birds—such as this law provides—as a war measure. It declares that victory in these times perches on the banners of the nation with the best food supply and argues that the value of birds as insect destroyers, and consequently as crop protectors, is so great as to make the country's birds a potent force for victory.

This is an ingenious turn to what is well recognized, but not so well recognized by the general public as it should be. Notwithstanding the fruit and the grain they steal, the birds, and this includes songsters, the much despised sparrow, and even some varieties of game birds, are the farmers' firm friends. What they eat of fruit and grain is trifling. The worms and insects they eat might easily spoil untold millions of dollars' worth of crops. The Bureau of Biological Survey at Washington once estimated that the members of the sparrow family alone, in a single year, saved farmers the tidy sum of \$89,000,000. It declared, moreover, that "it is believed, without the aid of our feathered friends successful agriculture would be impossible."

Setting all aesthetic considerations aside, the country cannot afford to go on killing off its birds as it has done in the past. Most states have fairly enlightened laws limiting the killing of game birds and protecting songsters; but these laws are so conflicting that the Federal statute was found necessary to safeguard them on their migrations. In peace or war time the birds are entitled to all the protection the laws can give them; and the country's crops demand the protection of the birds against the enemies they alone can fight.

Following the turkey raisers' announcement that an epidemic is decimating their Thanksgiving crop, the ice trust may be expected to announce that an open winter will cause another raise in the price of ice.

If Henry Ford can help it, there won't be a family in the country without its Jitney car, its Jitney submarine and its Jitney airship.

According to some of our bifurcated fellow citizens, what Columbus discovered was only hyphenated America.

The First Airship.

As might be guessed, Germans are feeling a renewed pride in their Zeppelins, and hopes of bombardment St. Paul's and setting fire to London have been revived. It is curious to note that, utterly regardless of history, Germans impudently claim airships as a German invention, and hail Count Zeppelin as the Columbus of the air. It happens, however, that the rights in this respect of Colonel Renard and Colonel Krebs, two officers of the French balloon park at Chalais-Meudon, are fully secured by authentic records. In August, 1884, these two officers sailed in a dirigible against a brisk wind, and circumnavigated the park, alighting at the point from which they had started. Their cigar-shaped balloon had an engine and steering gear, and was the real pioneer airship. After that Santos Dumont and others came on the scene, and eventually Count Zeppelin elaborated his own type of airship. Great as his claims may be in regard to development, the title of the creator of airships certainly does not belong to him.

Jews and Armenians.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I read your editorial on "Armenia" on October 8 with great interest, but instead of expecting to read of the brutality of the Turkish officials against the powerless and unhappy Armenians, and instead of an appeal to the great American public to come to the rescue of these persecuted victims of "Allah's fanatics," I beheld a condemnation of Germany.

I don't venture to defend Germany; neither am I pro-German. It is not for the neutral countries to determine who is fighting for tyranny and militarism or for the market of the small and weak nationalities who are the victims of this terrible war.

Why not touch the other part? What about the thousands of Jews murdered at the hands of the Russian Cossacks ("Slav-Kurds") in Austria and Russia, and the hundreds of thousands of exiles who are driven to starvation and death, and the assaulting of women by the brave Russian soldiers?

These horrible, savage crimes are directed against that nationality which is not an enemy, but which contributed one-half of a million of their children and husbands as soldiers in the Russian army, and who are fighting most desperately, as the Russian generals admit themselves.

I hope that The Tribune will proceed to raise its voice and will call for the assistance and aid of the liberal American people in behalf of the unfortunate war victims, and by doing so it will accomplish a generous mission and will receive the gratitude of all people who are just and human.

IRVING WALL.
Springfield, Mass., Oct. 9, 1915.

WATCHFUL WAITING WON

Delay Brought the Country Through Without War.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Under the title, "Mr. Wilson's German Policy," I read, not long ago, an article in which the writer declared that we are a "peace-at-any-price" nation; asserted that the United States is inclined to be effeminate; accused us of being "sordidly commercialized"; and that the people have been influenced by a set of men whom he pictured as Utopian pacifists; affirmed that we are pusillanimous, decadent and cowardly, and spoke of us as having a big "yellow streak" as broad as a blanket.

May I say that most of us disagree with this fictitious and extraordinary idea of circumstances? "F. B." has sadly misinterpreted American intentions during the past year. The American nation has delayed, always ready to assert itself; it has waited patiently and with reward; altogether it has triumphed, for the German government has finally had to back down from its "high horse." "F. B." has been rather inclined to view things pessimistically, observing most of all our lack of decided action, and concluding therefrom.

It is true Germany and England in the recent past have not only exasperated but insulted the United States; meanwhile, our Executive has waited patiently, evidently procrastinating his next steps. Naturally the President has undergone severe criticism; it can hardly be expected otherwise; but in the end he has accomplished without loss of honor and blood what he set out to do—commanded German respect not by being "too proud to fight," but by letting the German government know that every added outrage it committed England would indirectly profit by. American perseverance has prevailed, and not through pusillanimity.

We don't want war because we see what it leads to; therefore, so long as we can in all fair justice to ourselves remain neutral let us by all means do so. Several weeks ago in The Tribune I criticized the President upon his unwavering neutrality, but now I must "give the devil his due" and say, "Bravo, Mr. President!"

The people of the United States have never yielded themselves to be influenced by any silly arguments of the pacifists advocating unpreparedness. We are too much alive to prevailing conditions to be persuaded by that sort of men.

Many of us have wanted war over recent happenings. Yet had we, the same ones who clamored for war, been President, would we have plunged millions of others deliberately into war? Certainly not. The United States before it rushes into any war must first be sure of the future; then most likely will think twice. So, then, this thinking twice is what has caused the sudden growth of a yellow streak, a yellow blanket, down our backs?

Ponder these things, "F. B."! When the United States enters a war sanctioned by all the American people it will be for a very good reason. When the American manhood becomes effeminate you may be sure that the world is coming to an end. When a yellow streak as big as a blanket dominates the feelings of the American people, then an elephant can pass through the eye of a needle. When Americans become cowardly through being so sordidly commercialized that they care more whether American business flourishes than they do whether we are respected as a nation, then Americanism is dead.

And allow me to say, in closing, that I'm very proud that my country has not plunged herself into an inglorious war, and that I am always intended to be American, first, last and all the time.

J. EDWARD LUMBARD, JR.
New York, Oct. 11, 1915.

'In the Greatness of His Folly.'

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: To so earnest a student of the Good Book as William Hohenzollern of Prussia it is needless, in view of recent events, to call his attention to the last three verses of the fifth chapter of Proverbs, especially the last, which reads:

"And in the greatness of his folly he shall go astray."

Probably few outside his own dominions can say who may become of the pious sovereign, but his memory will certainly be handed down to the remotest generations as the reckless ruler whose ambition lighted the torch that has laid waste some of the fairest scenes in both Eastern and Western Europe, and slaughtered thousands of innocent victims in no way responsible for the woes of the Vaterland or its alleged contracted limits.

If it were deemed a matter of common prudence by Great Britain, in view of his spectacular escape from Elba, to banish Napoleon to St. Helena, still more will it be incumbent on the victors in the present struggle to confine this modern Attila in some stronghold where he shall be powerless to harm either his former subjects, or, by escaping to this country (where he is said to have much lucre laid up against a rainy day), to endeavor to negotiate a new deal in the game of life.

J. HENRY HAGER.
West New Brighton, Staten Island, Oct. 8, 1915.

The Allied Loan.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Will you be good enough to answer the following question in your paper? Is not the object of the Allied loan here to enable the Allies to purchase in the states with American money, which at present is at a premium, or at least at par, instead of making purchases with their own money, which is at a discount? This seems to my mind to be the idea in a nutshell.

R. G. INGLETON.
Brooklyn, Oct. 9, 1915.

The object of the loan is undoubtedly to use American money to pay for supplies purchased here. But this method of relieving the exchange pressure helps American industry, and the Americans who lend their money to Great Britain and France lend it only on the theory that they have secured a profitable personal investment.—Ed.]

How to Vote the Suffrage Amendment.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Can you tell me what form the ballot will take for the enfranchising of women? I want to be prepared to vote yes or no upon the subject.

I may add that while I am not too proud to fight, the voice with the smile wins, and truly the hand that rocks the cradle rocks the boat.

HENRY PECK SRAPEL.
New York, Oct. 8, 1915.

The suffrage amendment will be submitted independently of the new constitution. You can vote yes or no on this separate question.—Ed.]

"Armenia."

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Permit me to congratulate you for your stand for humanity against the atrocities by your good and wonderful editorial for Armenia.

I thank you very much in the name of all Armenians for your kindness.

K. D. ZAKARIAS.
New York, Oct. 9, 1915.

DON'T DELAY SCHOOL REFORM

Wirt Plan Solves the City's Present Difficulties and Should Be Adopted Without Interminable Debate.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It is difficult to understand why the school authorities should hesitate to adopt a policy for extending the Gary plan in the New York schools. Much misunderstanding and not a little misrepresentation of essential features have served to cloud the issue, but those members of the Board of Education who have heard Mr. Wirt's replies to the objections raised by the city's educational experts at the hearings before the Board of Superintendents, the Mayor and the Controller have certainly had ample opportunity to understand the facts.

The minor pedagogical considerations which have been brought out in these meetings should not be allowed to delay unduly the early introduction of this plan, starting with schools where only slight structural changes, if any, are required and extending elsewhere as rapidly as necessary equipment and alterations can be provided. In view of the expedition with which the Ettinger schools were fitted up a year ago, it would seem that the school authorities need have little fear of difficulty in providing adequate facilities for the Gary plan within a reasonably short time if once they should decide to undertake such a reorganization.

The impression has been studiously created, however, that even if such structural changes could be brought about in a short time, there are pedagogical factors involved which are of such occult and mysterious nature as to be beyond the comprehension of the ordinary lay mind. The argument evidently is that while part time could be thus eliminated and the school day lengthened to six or more hours, it would be accomplished at such a sacrifice of the educational welfare of the child that it would be far better to proceed under the present intolerable conditions than to move forward along the proposed new lines.

A résumé of these pedagogical objections and Mr. Wirt's replies reveals the unsoundness of the objections and the clear-cut simplicity of the Gary principle.

The most common objection is that the introduction of the Gary plan makes departmental teaching for young children necessary. The fact is that, while such extensive departmental instruction is possible, it is not essential. Mrs. Ritter has pointed out that she does not have it in Public School 89, although her teachers are now clamoring for it, while Mr. Patri says that he does have it in Public School 45, in The Bronx, and strongly favors it. As Mrs. Ritter aptly remarked at the Board of Estimate meeting, it is a remarkable tribute to the flexibility of the Gary programme that two principals should follow such different policies and yet be satisfied and successful. It confirms Mr. Wirt's assertion that the programme should and could be modified to suit the needs of every school.

A second objection is that the auditorium period is substituted for classroom instruction, and that the child thereby loses certain necessary academic training. This is not true. Time for auditorium work is secured not by taking time from regular instruction, but by lengthening the school day. Its value should therefore be judged in comparison with the street influences it displaces. Mrs. Ritter and Mr. Patri both confirmed Mr. Wirt's statement that as much time for academic instruction is given under his plan as in the traditional five-hour school. In view of the fact, therefore, that the children have the same teachers and lose no time in the classroom, it is difficult for the lay mind to understand how academic work could suffer through giving additional time for auditorium activities.

A third objection is that four teachers for twelve classes do not provide sufficient supervision for the playground. The educational authorities apparently believe that one teacher is needed for every small class unit on the playground. Mr. Wirt's reply is that there is nothing in his plan to prevent the use of more teachers on the playground if it is so desired, but he believes that four specially trained teachers are sufficient to care for twelve classes during this period. In his opinion, play is in itself educational when it is given under conditions which develop initiative and responsibility

and create natural situations in which older children can exercise, under wise supervision, their instinctive desire for leadership. Too much supervision of play by teachers would tend to limit the possibilities for the development of such qualities through carrying over to the playground the rigidity of the classroom. This answer to the third pedagogical objection raised seems reasonable to those of us who have played under such conditions.

A further criticism raised by the educational authorities is that outside instruction in the home or in the church is permitted, but that no means is provided for seeing that such instruction is the equivalent of regular schooling. It would be very unfortunate if the school undertook to insure that such instruction should be the equivalent of regular schooling, for in that case the school would be supervising religious instruction, which the Gary plan, in consonance with the law, expressly prohibits. The programme simply provides that the child can be excused during the day to take private lessons at home or attend religious instruction if the parent so desires. These periods are never taken from the academic work, and therefore do not detract from the regular work of the school. As in the case of play and auditorium, it is simply time which, in the traditional school, the child would spend upon the street. What is taught in these outside classes and how it is taught is not, and should not be, the concern of the school.

From press reports of the conference yesterday between the Board of Estimate and the Board of Education, it would seem that despite these pedagogical difficulties a way may be found to extend the Gary plan at an early date to the schools in which children are suffering from part time. It is to be hoped that action in this direction by the school authorities will be taken promptly. In taking such action, however, it is important that the work-study-and-play schools provided be organized this time along the lines worked out by Mr. Wirt.

It has been customary for those who have been opposing this progressive policy to preface their remarks with expressions of unbounded admiration for the Gary plan. The public is not interested, however, in these reiterated professions of faith, for it is too conscious of the fact that there are nearly one hundred and fifty thousand children receiving less than five hours' instruction daily. It desires action. It looks with approval upon the disposition of the financial authorities to appropriate \$6,000,000 to make the necessary changes to alleviate this condition. It recognizes the futility of expecting to receive in the near future thirty or forty millions of dollars for new buildings, even if the reserved seat basis of organization offered the best type of education. It is anxious that the children of the city shall not be sacrificed through undue delay in beginning a programme that will handle the situation within the city's financial ability.

HOWARD W. NUDD,
Director Public Education Association of the City of New York.

New York, Oct. 12, 1915.

Fears Women Officeholders.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The suffragists maintain that the male vote of the family is not enough. However much the husband may have his wife's interests at heart, he, being a man, cannot get woman's point of view. Hence the need of suffrage.

If we grant women the vote on these grounds I fail to see how we can be consistent without making great changes in our form of government. For if a woman cannot trust her point of view to her husband, who is near and dear to her, how much less can she trust it to the man for whom she votes? His point of view is just as masculine as is her husband's, and our feminine voter is no better off than before. The only way we can present the feminine point of view is through women. As women would be one-half of the electorate, they should form one-half of the government. They should hold one-half of the offices and have exactly one-half of the governing power. In this way only can we present woman's point of view.

AUSTIN K. WARDWELL,
Williamstown, Mass., Oct. 10, 1915.

UNITED IRELAND

An Obvious Phenomenon Unaffected by Irish-American Humbug.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In your issue of the 7th inst. Mr. Paul J. Ralleggh asks why England retains an army of 60,000 men in Ireland. A majority of this force is made up of Irish recruits training for the front; there are large camps for Irish recruits at Fermoy, the Curragh, Athlone and one in Ulster. Probably there are some English soldiers among them, but there are many regiments of Irish troops in England. This army maintained in Ireland for the same reason that immense armies are maintained in England and Scotland, and for no other reason. It is also asked why England did not leave the defence of Ireland to Irishmen, as Mr. Redmond suggested. The first line of defence of Ireland, as well as of England, is the British navy, and while the navy holds its present position of invincibility there is no need to talk of defending Ireland by other means. The second line of defence is the line of trenches in Flanders, and England has entrusted a fair share of that war to Irishmen, and there is no complaint as to the way they do their duty.

Mr. Ralleggh asks whether Ireland would fight for or against England if all the Irish people were armed. Well, a large number of them are armed and they are all free to express their opinions on the war. The members of Parliament are elected by the people, and the British government must interfere with the voters. In all the elections held in Nationalist Ireland since the war began Mr. Redmond's pro-Ally policy has been upheld at the polls, and the numerous local elective bodies have all expressed themselves in the same way. The devotion of Catholic Belgium and the historic friendship for the France of Sarfildel and the Irish brigades and MacMahon have swayed the sympathies of the Irish people more than any other consideration.

Whenever Ireland felt that she had a grievance against England she was not slow to let the world know about it, and no amount of coercion could stifle the voice of the Irish. But the England which Ireland has had to deal in the last twenty-five years is a far different England from the England of the last centuries. Of all the countries of the world, Ireland has suffered the least from the effects of the war. The Home Rule Bill is a solemn contract between the English and Irish nations, and the pro-Ally policy of Mr. Redmond and the Irish Nationalist party is the only policy consistent with the honor and interests of Ireland.

There are in America some Irishmen who harbor feelings of resentment against England, but they are not representative. The Clart-Guel is a small, noisy group of ignorant Irishmen, manipulated by clever politicians who were quick to see the financial possibilities of dangling before German eyes an Irish revolution that would destroy England. German agents have been captivated by the idea, and the bank accounts of some Irishmen have been substantially increased. That explains the grandstand play of the professional Irishmen. The Irish people in Ireland and America are not fools, and there will be no attempt at rebellion in Ireland, and there will be no political alliance between the Germans and Irish in this country, as far as the Irish are concerned.

New York, Oct. 9, 1915. HIBERNICUS.

Newspaper Reading for Pupils.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Do people know that on an average there are five boys reading a daily newspaper against one girl? I mean boys and girls ranging in age from twelve to eighteen years. If every school teacher would spend pupils (I mean girls mostly) to read papers, telling them the benefits and advantages derived therefrom, there would be no necessity for anybody to say that most young girls can't answer correctly a simple question.

I would suggest that there be in every school one period a day devoted to newspaper reading. This class should have at its head a teacher who has a wide knowledge of big questions. Debates should be had. Don't you think that our school principals should take the initiative and start such periods running on short time?

IRVING BIRNBAUM.
New York, Oct. 11, 1915.